Francis Young, ed.

Rookwood Family Papers, 1606–1761. Suffolk Records Society, Volume 59. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2016. Pp. lx + 115. Hb, \$45.

Rookwood is not a name quickly recognized by many readers of this journal. The family suffered for its adherence to Catholicism in early modern England. Ambrose Rookwood, arguably the most (in)famous member of the family, was executed in 1606 for the Gunpowder Plot. In its quest for incriminating documents, authorities ransacked Coldham Hall, Suffolk, in November, 1605 with the consequent loss of all pre–1606 documents. The documents edited highlight the family's efforts to rebuild after this disaster. I shall focus on the family's Jesuit connections.

The Jesuit John Gerard, erroneously described as the superior of the mission (xviii), used Coldham Hall, constructed in the 1570s, as a base for his ministries in east Anglia. Subsequent association with the Society of Jesus made life even more precarious for the family. But Young, most likely capitulating to a flawed, popular image of a fire-brand Jesuit, blames the Society for Ambrose's political involvement: "[his] early encounters with Jesuits and his own Jesuit education imbued him with the radical ideals of the Counter-Reformation" (xxi). Presumably regime change was included in the core curriculum of his education. But something about Jesuit pedagogy must have appealed to the Rookwoods because they continued to frequent their schools and to patronize the Society especially the College of the Holy Apostles in East Anglia. A familiar preference for the Society however did not include the abandonment of other orders and congregations. Ambrose Rookwood (II) had at least eight children who entered religious life: three became priests (a Jesuit, a Benedictine, a Franciscan), and five nuns (four Poor Clares and one, an Augustinian canoness). The diversity of religious vocations, especially among the men, confirms Michael Questier's argument that recusant families despite strong preferences for secular or religious clergy did not exclude cooperation with or assistance for the others. (See *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006], 333, 446.) The same eclecticism (or, if you prefer, ecumenism) can be seen in the library's holdings. An eighteenth-century inventory of Catholic books at Coldham Hall opens a window into the reading habits of Catholic gentry.

Another son of Ambrose Rookwood (II), Ambrose (IV) was found guilty of conspiracy to assassinate King William III and executed on April 29, 1696. Ironically for the Rookwoods, the century ended as it began: executions for treason. Ambrose I was sentenced in 1606 for the Gunpowder Plot aimed at the destruction of the political establishment and King James I. Ninety years later

Ambrose I's great-grandson Ambrose IV's devotion to James I's grandson James II lay behind his involvement in the Barclay Conspiracy against the usurper William. Ambrose I and Ambrose IV were hanged, drawn, and quartered, the first at Old Palace Yard, Westminster, and the second, at Tyburn. That the family survived as landed gentry was no mean achievement.

The author's lack of familiarity with Jesuit vocabulary and religious life creates occasional confusion. (Hannah Thomas in her review of Young's *The Gages of Hengrave and Suffolk Catholicism, 1640–1767* in this issue comments on similar mistakes.) John Gage, a son of Elizabeth Rookwood, studied at the English College of St. Omers, and entered the Society at the novitiate in Watten in 1740. Young misconstrues entrance as ordination. A more perplexing statement follows this misinterpretation: "Unlike most Jesuits, who were received into the Society of Jesus as brothers and later ordained, John Gage was not professed as a Jesuit until 2 February 1756" (liv). Correcting each error in this sentence would demand a small treatise; suffice it to say there is nothing irregular about the date of his final profession, generally made three to five years after ordination. Young could have avoided errors in his list of Jesuit authors if he had consulted my *English and Welsh Jesuits, 1555–1650*, 2 vols. (London: Catholic Record Society, 1994), and Geoffrey Holt's *The English Jesuits 1650–1829* (London: Catholic Record Society, 1984). Young lists Holt's volume in his bibliography, but ignored it for this account of John Gage, and for the dates and aliases of English Jesuits. Because of these errors, anyone interested in English Jesuits should use this volume carefully.

Thomas M. McCoog, S.J.

Fordham University

tmmccoog@gmail.com

DOI 10.1163/22141332-00401005-12